



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,944	02/22/2006	Thorsten Zank	12810-00193-US	5346
23416	7590	11/25/2009	EXAMINER	
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP			MCELWAIN, ELIZABETH F	
P O BOX 2207				
WILMINGTON, DE 19899			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1638	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/25/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/566,944	ZANK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Elizabeth F. McElwain	1638	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-11 and delta-6 desaturase and delta-elongase, in the replies filed on April 15, 2009 and August 3, 2009 are acknowledged. Applicants also elected the following SEQ ID NOs for search purposes: SEQ ID NO: 23, 24, 27, 28, 41, 42, 77, 78, 87, 88, 99, 100, 109 and 110. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the art relevant to Group I would be relevant to the other Groups II-IV and would not require an undue burden. This is not found persuasive because the oils, process of mixing oils and products made with said oils are distinct products and processes that would require additional search and examination, which would be an undue burden on the Examiner for the reasons set forth in the restriction requirement.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 2 are objected to for reciting nonelected inventions of delta-9 elongases and delta-8 desaturases. Amendment of the claims to delete the nonelected subject matter is requested.

Claims 2-4 are objected to for reciting nonelected SEQ ID numbers. Amendment of the claims to delete the nonelected subject matter is requested. Alternatively, applicant could make a statement on the record that the sequences are obvious one over the others and therefore do not constitute different inventions.

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: it is unclear if there is a brief description provided for each of the drawings. A brief description must be provided for each drawing.
2. In addition, the MPEP suggests a layout for the specification along with preferred headings for each section, which have not been used in the present specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because there is more than one paragraph. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claim 3 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 3 of copending Application No. 10/590,958.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-9 of Application No. 10/590,958 is drawn to a method of making polyunsaturated fatty acids in an organism by transforming the organism with an omega-3 desaturase coding sequence in combination with other fatty acid biosynthesis genes., which

would be obvious in view of the present claim drawn to a method of making polyunsaturated fatty acids in an organism by transforming the organism with an omega-3 desaturase coding sequence and optionally together with other fatty acid biosynthesis genes

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1 and 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Drexler et al (J Plant Physiol 160 (7): 779-802, July 2003 in IDS and cited in the International Search Report).

8. The claims are drawn to a process to produce compounds of Formula I having from 9 carbons to 31 carbons and having from 2 double bonds to 6 double bonds in an organism with at least 1% of these compounds based on total lipid content by introducing into the organism coding sequences for a delta-6 elongase, a delta-6 desaturase, a delta-5 desaturase, a delta-5 elongase, and a delta-4 desaturase.

9. Drexler et al teach a process to produce compounds of Formula I having from 9 carbons to 31 carbons and having from 2 double bonds to 6 double bonds in a plant by introducing into

the plant coding sequences for a delta-6 elongase, a delta-6 desaturase, a delta-5 desaturase, a delta-5 elongase, and a delta-4 desaturase (see pages 794-796 and Figure 6, for example), wherein the biosynthetic pathway is known and genes for each of these enzymes are cloned from numerous eukaryotic organisms and bacteria. Drexler et al also teach transformation of canola (*Brassica*) with desaturase coding sequences (page 796, the last full paragraph) to produce polyunsaturated fatty acids (18:3). And the recited substituents of R2 and R3 and the percentage of Formula I compounds would be inherent in the same process.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1638

12. Claims 1, 2 and 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexler et al (J Plant Physiol 160 (7): 779-802, July 2003 in IDS) taken with Geneseq Accession ABV74260 (Lerchl et al, July 25, 2002).

13. The claims are drawn to a process to produce compounds of Formula I having from 9 carbons to 31 carbons and having from 2 double bonds to 6 double bonds in an organism with at least 1% of these compounds based on total lipid content by introducing into the organism coding sequences for a delta-6 elongase, a delta-6 desaturase, a delta-5 desaturase, a delta-5 elongase, and a delta-4 desaturase.

Drexler et al teach a process to produce compounds of Formula I having from 9 carbons to 31 carbons and having from 2 double bonds to 6 double bonds in an organism with at least 1% of these compounds based on total lipid content by introducing into the organism coding sequences for a delta-6 elongase, a delta-6 desaturase, a delta-5 desaturase, a delta-5 elongase, and a delta-4 desaturase (see pages 794-796 and Figure 6, for example), wherein genes for each of these enzymes are cloned from eukaryotic organisms and bacteria. Drexler et al also teach transformation of canola (*Brassica*) with desaturase coding sequences (page 796, the last full paragraph), as stated above.

Drexler et al do not teach the delta-6 desaturase of SEQ ID NO: 23.

Geneseq Accession ABV74260 teaches SEQ ID NO: 23.

Given the teachings of Drexler et al of the desirability of producing very long chain polyunsaturated fatty acids in a plant by transforming a plant with genes encoding a delta-6 elongase, a delta-6 desaturase, a delta-5 desaturase, a delta-5 elongase, and a delta-4 desaturase, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to practice the same method and to

substitute other known sequences, such as the delta-6 desaturase from *Physcomitrella* taught by Geneseq Accession ABV74260. And the particular R2 and R3 constituents and levels of polyunsaturated fatty acids would be the optimization of process parameters and would not confer patentable distinction to the claimed invention. Thus the claimed invention would have been *prima facie* obvious as a whole to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time it was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

14. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexler et al (J Plant Physiol 160 (7): 779-802, July 2003 in IDS) taken with Geneseq Accession ABV74262 (Lerchl et al, March 28, 2003).

15. The claims are drawn to a process to produce compounds of Formula I having from 9 carbons to 31 carbons and having from 2 double bonds to 6 double bonds in an organism with at least 1% of these compounds based on total lipid content by introducing into the organism coding sequences for a delta-6 elongase, a delta-6 desaturase, a delta-5 desaturase, a delta-5 elongase, and a delta-4 desaturase.

Drexler et al teach a process to produce compounds of Formula I having from 9 carbons to 31 carbons and having from 2 double bonds to 6 double bonds in an organism with at least 1% of these compounds based on total lipid content by introducing into the organism coding sequences for a delta-6 elongase, a delta-6 desaturase, a delta-5 desaturase, a delta-5 elongase, and a delta-4 desaturase (see pages 794-796 and Figure 6, for example), wherein genes for each of these enzymes are cloned from eukaryotic organisms and bacteria. Drexler et al also teach transformation of canola (*Brassica*) with desaturase coding sequences (page 796, the last full

paragraph), including a delta-12 desaturase coding sequence for the production of gamma-linolenic acid (18:3).

Drexler et al do not teach a delta-12 desaturase of SEQ ID NO: 110.

Geneseq Accession ABV74262 teaches a sequence 62.9% identical to SEQ ID NO: 110.

Given the teachings of Drexler et al of the desirability of producing long chain polyunsaturated fatty acids in a plant by transforming a plant with genes encoding a delta-6 elongase, a delta-6 desaturase, a delta-5 desaturase, a delta-5 elongase, a delta-4 desaturase, and a delta-12 desaturase, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to practice the same method and to substitute other known sequences, such as the delta-12 desaturase from *Phaeodactylum* taught by Geneseq Accession ABV74262. And the particular R2 and R3 constituents and levels of polyunsaturated fatty acids would be the optimization of process parameters and would not confer patentable distinction to the claimed invention. Thus the claimed invention would have been *prima facie* obvious as a whole to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time it was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

16. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexler et al (J Plant Physiol 160 (7): 779-802, July 2003 in IDS) taken with EST Accession BE777235 (Kamoun et al September 20, 2000).

The claims are drawn to a process to produce compounds of Formula I having from 9 carbons to 31 carbons and having from 2 double bonds to 6 double bonds in an organism with at least 1% of these compounds based on total lipid content by introducing into the organism coding sequences for a delta-6 elongase, a delta-6 desaturase, a delta-5 desaturase, a delta-5

Art Unit: 1638

elongase, a delta-4 desaturase and an omega-3 desaturase. Drexler et al also teach transformation of canola (*Brassica*) with additional desaturase coding sequences (page 796, the last full paragraph), such as a delta-12 desaturase coding sequence for the production of polyunsaturated fatty acids.

Drexler et al teach a process to produce compounds of Formula I having from 9 carbons to 31 carbons and having from 2 double bonds to 6 double bonds in an organism with at least 1% of these compounds based on total lipid content by introducing into the organism coding sequences for a delta-6 elongase, a delta-6 desaturase, a delta-5 desaturase, a delta-5 elongase, and a delta-4 desaturase (see pages 794-796 and Figure 6, for example), wherein genes for each of these enzymes are cloned from eukaryotic organisms and bacteria. Drexler et al also teach transformation of canola (*Brassica*) with desaturase coding sequences (page 796, the last full paragraph), including a delta-12 desaturase coding sequence for the production of polyunsaturated fatty acids in a plant.

Drexler et al do not teach an omega-3 desaturase of SEQ ID NO: 88.

EST Accession BE777235 discloses an omega-3 desaturase having 60% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO: 88.

Given the teachings of Drexler et al of the desirability of producing long chain polyunsaturated fatty acids in a plant by transforming a plant with genes encoding a delta-6 elongase, a delta-6 desaturase, a delta-5 desaturase, a delta-5 elongase, a delta-4 desaturase, and a delta-12 desaturase, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to practice the same method and to substitute other known sequences in the omega-3 pathway, such as the omega-3 desaturase of EST Accession BE777235. And the particular R2 and R3 constituents

Art Unit: 1638

and levels of polyunsaturated fatty acids would be the optimization of process parameters and would not confer patentable distinction to the claimed invention. Thus the claimed invention would have been *prima facie* obvious as a whole to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time it was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Applicant is advised that of the sequences that were elected, SEQ ID NO: 77 encoding SEQ ID NO: 78 is the only sequence pair that was searched and found to be free of the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth F. McElwain whose telephone number is (571) 272-0802. The examiner can normally be reached on increased flex time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anne Marie Grunberg can be reached on (571) 272-0975. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EFM

/Elizabeth F. McElwain/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1638